



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/918,107	07/30/2001	Patrick Aurichio	YOR920010210US1	2781
29154	7590	01/08/2008	EXAMINER	
FREDERICK W. GIBB, III			CHOI, PETER H	
Gibb & Rahman, LLC			ART UNIT	
2568-A RIVA ROAD			PAPER NUMBER	
SUITE 304			3623	
ANNAPOLIS, MD 21401			MAIL DATE	
			DELIVERY MODE	
			01/08/2008	
			PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

**BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS  
AND INTERFERENCES**

Application Number: 09/918,107  
Filing Date: July 30, 2001  
Appellant(s): AURRICHIO ET AL.

**MAILED**

JAN 08 2008

**GROUP 3600**

Duane N. Moore (Reg No. 53,352)  
For Appellant

**EXAMINER'S ANSWER**

This is in response to the appeal brief filed October 22, 2007 appealing from the Office action mailed April 11, 2007.

**(1) Real Party in Interest**

A statement identifying by name the real party in interest is contained in the brief.

**(2) Related Appeals and Interferences**

The examiner is not aware of any related appeals, interferences, or judicial proceedings which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal.

**(3) Status of Claims**

The statement of the status of claims contained in the brief is incorrect. A correct statement of the status of the claims is as follows:

This appeal involves claims 1-15, 17-26, 28-34, 36-52, and 54-55.

Claims 1-6, 9-13, 15, 17, 19-24, 28-32, 34, 36, 38-43, 46-50, 52 and 54 are rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beldock (US Patent #6,490,565).

Claims 7, 18, 25, 37, 44 and 55 are rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beldock in view of Petke et al. (US Patent #6,163,732).

Claims 8, 26 and 45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beldock in view of Barrett et al. (US Patent #6,029,144).

Claims 14, 33 and 51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beldock in view of Smalley et al. (US Patent #6,067,549).

**(4) Status of Amendments After Final**

The appellant's statement of the status of amendments after final rejection contained in the brief is correct.

**(5) Summary of Claimed Subject Matter**

The summary of claimed subject matter contained in the brief is correct.

**(6) Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal**

The appellant's statement of the grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal is correct.

**(7) Claims Appendix**

The copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the brief is correct.

**(8) Evidence Relied Upon**

6490565	Beldock	12-2002
6,163,732	Petke et al.	12-2000
6,029,144	Barrett et al.	2-2000
6,067,549	Smalley et al.	5-2000

**(9) Grounds of Rejection**

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-6, 9-13, 15, 17, 19-24, 28-32, 34, 36, 38-43, 46-50, 52, and 54 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beldock (U.S Patent #6,490,565).

As per claim 1, Beldock teaches a method for monitoring environmental performance information (**environmental certification program**) and providing notification when said performance information indicates performance reaching a predetermined level, the method comprising the steps of:

(a) setting performance criteria (**program defines the criteria which must be met by a participant in the program in order to be in compliance**) to capture performance information (**compliance with predefined program criteria, including energy efficiency, use of renewable energy, recycling, waste minimization, health and safety, reduction of environmental liabilities, and corporate citizenship**) at specific times by a predetermined schedule (**participant is approved for certification at 18, preferably within two months of 'year 0'; compliance certification is**

Art Unit: 3623

**performed every year {a plurality of compliance requirements for year 1, year 2, year 3, year 4, year 6, year 8 and every two years thereafter are disclosed}}** in a system [Column 3, lines 28-34, Column 4, lines 45-46, Column 4, line 54 – Column 5, line 31, Column 5, lines 55-63; Claim 1A];

(c) storing said performance information in a database (**compliance data is entered at 16 into database 12**) as a according to an area of interest of said performance information (**the compliance criteria is based on profitable environmental measures, or PEMs, which are directed to areas of interest such as energy efficiency, the use of renewable energy, recycling, waste minimization, health and safety, reduction of environmental liabilities, and corporate citizenship**) [Column 3, lines 30-38, 56-57, Column 4, lines 41-43, Column 5, lines 55-57, Claims 1c, 15c];

(d) monitoring said performance information for conformance with said performance criteria as it is currently stored (**evaluate and track the compliance of a participant; program defines the criteria which must be met by a participant in the program in order to be in compliance; the participant must implement (and maintain) a predefined number of additional PEMs at specified years after certification in order to maintain certification; {participant is evaluated at year 0, year 1, year 2, year 3, year 4, and year (4+2n)}**) [Column 3, lines 28-30, 56-57, 60-65, Column 4, lines 7-9, Figure 3, Claims 1a, 15a];

(e) flagging said performance information that does not conform with said performance criteria (**recording a non-compliance in the database**) and generating a

Art Unit: 3623

report one of automatically and manually according to at least a portion of said performance information currently stored (**system outputs at 18 whether the participant is in compliance and therefore certified or outputs at 20 whether the participant is not in compliance and is therefore not certified**) [Column 3, lines 56-57, 60-66, Claims 1f, 15f];

(f) providing notification (**system outputs at 18 whether the participant is in compliance and therefore certified or outputs at 20 whether the participant is not in compliance and is therefore not certified**) when said performance information deviates from said performance criteria (**identified profitable environmental measure are reported to the organizers of the environmental certification program and input into the database 12; participant reports its compliance {or non-compliance} with the program to the organizers of the program**) [Column 3, lines 59-66, Column 4, lines 40-43, Column 5, lines 55-57];

(g) modifying said performance so that said performance conforms with said performance criteria (**participants are given a short period of time in which to correct any inadvertent defects in its compliance**) [Column 6, lines 4-6]; and

(h) wherein said modifying said performance is conducted immediately subsequent to said providing notification when said performance information deviates from said performance criteria **{the participant is apprised of its failure to comply with particular requirements, which are allowed to be remedied during the brief grace period}** [Column 5, line 64 – Column 6, line 9].

Beldock does not explicitly teach:

(b) accepting a plurality of forms from a plurality of sites at specific times by said predetermined schedule, each of said forms including instructions, definitions and said performance information according to uniform data definitions.

However, Beldock collects performance information from a plurality of facilities to assess program compliance with predefined criteria based on a function of performance at a plurality of facilities (the program requires that 4 profitable environmental measures are presently implemented at at least one facility, 4 profitable environmental measures are implemented in at least one facility, or a combination, and that said profitable environmental measures are implemented in 75% of all facilities within 3 years of initial certification in order to maintain certification) [Column 4, line 4- Column 5, line 53]. The environmental certification program taught by Beldock also teaches the step of obtaining certification compliance data after assessment (at specific times) of each year's predetermined certification conditions for compliance (as determined by a set of predetermined certification criteria for each year), as compliance data is entered into the database [Column 3, lines 59-60, Column 5, lines 55-63]. Furthermore, the Beldock system provides uniform criteria for participants in the program, as the terms of compliance are the same for all participants [Column 2, lines 42, 59-60], thus the performance information is a function of uniform data definitions (compliance criteria).



It has been admitted as prior art, as a result of untimely and/or improperly challenged Official Notice, that it is old and well known in the art to include instructions and definitions along with performance information. Beldock teaches an environmental certification program that defines a plurality of predefined criteria which must be met by a participant in the program [Column 2, lines 10-13]; therefore, instructions and definitions would enable the user to correctly interpret data and compliance according to said predefined criteria. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the teachings of Beldock to accept instructions and definitions along with performance information, because doing so would allow Beldock to understand and interpret the performance information, and would further provide the user with further instructions for usage of the performance information.

While Beldock teaches the step of collecting performance information data from a plurality of sites, Beldock is silent regarding the use of forms.

However, a form is merely a document with blank spaces for insertion of required or requested information, which are usually transferred to a computer database for storage and subsequent analysis. Beldock teaches the step of entering compliance data into the database, which included the step of creating or filling out a document with the required/requested compliance information, thus implying the use of forms in the Beldock system.

Furthermore, it has been admitted as prior art, as a result of untimely and/or improperly challenged Official Notice, that forms are used in transmitting data (such as Electronic Data Interchange, survey results, questionnaires, facsimile, e-mail, etc.). Beldock tracks the compliance of a participant in the environmental certification program and also conducts on-site verification of compliance [Column 2, lines 21-23, Column 3, lines 55-57]; thus, using forms to enter data would provide a uniform data set for each participant, easing the burden of data processing and further enabling utilization of the Beldock system on a global scale. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the teachings of Beldock to use forms to transmit performance information, because the resulting combination would enable the use of data transfer means such as Electronic Data Interchange, and standardize the presentation of data on said forms (to include pre-filled data such as company name, address, etc.), which would enable the automated processing of information on the forms and automates the process of providing access to information, facilitating the sharing of information with downstream processes (such as manufacturing, marketing, purchasing, and sales).

Beldock does not explicitly teach said modifying of said performance occurring in real time. However, Official Notice is taken that real-time updating is old and well known in the art. Beldock teaches that participants are given a short period of time in which to correct any inadvertent defects in its compliance [Column 5, line 65 – Column 6, line 19]; thus, modifying performance in real time would facilitate the changes needed to

correct all aspects in which the participant is in non-compliance, thereby making the participant eligible to use the certification mark again. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the teachings of Beldock to modify performance in real time, because doing so would allow participants to continuously monitor performance and implement corrective measures in order to be in compliance with predefined criteria and retain eligibility to display said certification mark. The eligibility to display certification marks and be in compliance with predefined criteria has been identified by Beldock as being beneficial and a goal of participants, as Beldock explains that companies vie for environmental awards given by the government for the prestige associated with such awards, perceived economic value, and public awareness and that the certification mark provided by the program has discernable value in the marketplace, signifying the participant's dedication to environmental concerns and the willingness to be a model environmental citizen.

[Column 1, lines 32-52].

Beldock provides uniform criteria for participants in the certification program in the event that no specific evaluation criteria is designated for use. Beldock does not explicitly teach that performance criteria is set at one of a global, a regional, and a site-specific level. However, it has been admitted as prior art, as a result of untimely and/or improperly challenged Official Notice, that it is old and well known in the art to for compliance data to be updated to reflect changes in federal, state, and local laws and regulations, program requirements of federal and state-funded programs, and industry

standards (such as ISO certification, Quality Control Initiatives, etc.), as well as self-imposed rules and regulations. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the teachings of Beldock to include global, regional, and site-specific levels of performance criteria, because doing so provides Beldock the flexibility to tailor the evaluation to local circumstances, further providing the environmental certification method of Beldock more credibility and can be practically implemented on a local, regional, or global level, thereby expanding the use of the Beldock system.

Beldock does not explicitly teach:

(i) automatically creating an audit trail to said forms, wherein said audit trail comprises: a name of an author, a creation date, a name of a modifying user, and a date of modification

However, It has been admitted as prior art, as a result of untimely and/or improperly challenged Official Notice, that it is old and well known in the computing arts that computer operating systems use Master File Tables to store resident attributes for each computer file, including the filename, data, times of creation/modification or access and the user who last created/modified/accessed said file.

Beldock stores data in a database; thus, using Master File Tables would provide means of tracking activity by users to track the integrity of data using audit trails.

Furthermore, it has been admitted as prior art, as a result of untimely and/or improperly challenged Official Notice, that it is old and well known in the computing arts to create audit trails of data usage within the system, especially within databases. Audit trail techniques contribute to data integrity because it is desirable to have a past record of events where the sequence of events can be traced. Audit trails are helpful in investigations to verify the status of something or to determine where or when unauthorized activities took place. Sometimes, those who are authorized to access data abuse that right by using it for unauthorized purposes. Audit trails make it possible to discover the offender. The audit trail can be closely monitored for any unusual activity. An audit trail is a chronological record of events that occurred in the system, and enables users to retrace the steps through the system and reconstruct the sequence of events that occurred. Audit trails store information that attribute files to an author (or modifying user) and timestamp said file (upon creation and modification).

Furthermore, it was known at the time of the invention that merely providing an automated way to replace a well-known activity which accomplishes the same result is not sufficient to distinguish over the prior art. *In re Venner*, 262 F.2d 91, 95, 120 USPQ 193, 194 (CCPA 1958). Furthermore, it is well settled that it is not "invention" to broadly provide a mechanical or automatic means to replace manual activity which has accomplished the same result. *In re Venner*, 120 USPQ 192.

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the teachings of Beldock to implement audit trail measures known in the art in order to obtain the additional benefits of providing a historical record of events that enable users to determine the abusive actions and identifies of (authorized and unauthorized) users, as described above, providing a sense of accountability and responsibility amongst users.

As per claims 2-5, Beldock teaches monitoring the currently stored performance information of a specific set of sites for conformance with site-specific performance criteria **(additional profitable environmental measures must be implemented in one of the organization's facilities in order to maintain the privilege of using the certification mark {indicating compliance with the criteria of the program})** [Column 4, lines 55-57].

It has been admitted as prior art, as a result of untimely and/or improperly challenged Official Notice, that an organization can comprise a single site, or multiple sites. Beldock conducts on-site verification of participant certification; thus, the application of Beldock on a plurality of sites belonging to a single participant would expand the certification abilities of Beldock to include participants with multiple facilities. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to practice the teachings of Beldock over a single site or a plurality of sites,

because doing so would expand its ability to comprehensively evaluate compliance by applicants located in multiple sites.

As per claim 6, Beldock does not explicitly teach said step of providing notification further comprises sending notification via one or more of:

- e-mail;
- telephone;
- facsimile;
- pager; and
- postal mail.

However, it has been admitted as prior art, as a result of untimely and/or improperly challenged Official Notice, that distributing notification memos or documents using e-mail, telephone, facsimile, pager, or postal mail is old and well-known practice. Beldock reports participant's compliance with the program for input into a database [Column 5, lines 55-57]; thus, the Examiner asserts that one of ordinary skill in the art would employ well known communication means to transmit said reports. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to employ said old and well-known means because doing so would allow Beldock to conveniently and quickly (quicker than traditional (mail) delivery means) distribute notification in user-friendly formats to necessary, globally dispersed recipients.

As per claim 9, Beldock teaches the method of claim 1, wherein said areas of interest include one or more of:

- air (**air pollution**) [Figure 1d];
- water (**water contamination**) [Figure 1d];
- waste (**recycling; waste minimization**) [Figures 1b, 1c];
- energy [Figures 1a, 1b];
- toxic chemical release inventory;
- containment (**removal of radon, asbestos, lead**) [Figure 1d];
- regulatory activity;
- cost and savings (**use of energy efficient items, renewable energy, recycling, minimizing waste**) [Figures 1a, 1b, 1c];
- facility general information;
- database meta information;
- health and safety information [Figure 1c]; and
- materials use and conservation information (**use of energy efficient items, renewable energy, recycling, minimizing waste**) [Figures 1a, 1b, 1c].

As per claim 10, Beldock teaches the method of claim 1 wherein said database is an Air Programs Database (**air pollution**) and the performance criteria is a high limit on emissions level (**reducing site air pollution**) [Figure 1d].



As per claim 11, Beldock teaches the method of claim 1 wherein said database is a Waste Management Database (**Waste Minimization**) and the performance criteria is a low limit on recycling quantities and percentage rates of nonhazardous waste (**water conservation and water saving technologies, low-moisture landscaping, efficient material use, hazardous materials safety, energy efficient apparel, efficient equipment use, environmentally-friendly cleaning products**) [Figure 1c].

As per claim 12, Beldock teaches the method of claim 1 wherein said database is an Energy Database (**Energy Efficiency, and Use of Renewable Energy**) and said performance criteria is a high limit on energy consumption (**use of energy efficient lighting technology, commercial appliances, heating and air conditioning, water heating, commercial/industrial technologies and mechanical systems, commercial equipment, windows, insulation, doors, office equipment, solar water heating, use of renewable technologies, alternatively fueled vehicles**) [Figures 1a, 1b].

As per claim 13, Beldock does not explicitly teach that said database is a Cost and Savings Database and said performance criteria is a low limit on cost to savings ratio to ensure that economic efficiency does not fall below a predetermined level.

However, it has been admitted as prior art, as a result of untimely and/or improperly challenged Official Notice, to employ a ratio (such as a cost: savings, cost:

Art Unit: 3623

benefit ratio) or similar means of comparison to express the advantages of using new technologies, equipment, policies, etc. and are used to evaluate efficiency of resources.

Beldock evaluates participants according to a plurality of predefined criteria that include a number of "profitable environmental measures" that are profitable to the participant [Column 2, lines 17-32]; thus, using economic efficiency ratios would provide an indicator of effective and cost-efficient measures. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the teachings of Beldock to track costs and savings data in a database to determine the efficiency and cost: benefit ratio of implementing various programs, technologies, and equipment to be used as a tool in assessing the effectiveness of such changes in company policy.

As per claim 15, Beldock does not explicitly teach assigning a specific access level to a user, wherein the access level further comprises:

reader;

author; and

editor,

wherein said reader is limited to viewing documents, author can view said documents, create said documents, and modify said documents created by said author, and the editor can read, create and modify all said documents.

However, it has been admitted as prior art, as a result of untimely and/or improperly challenged Official Notice, that access control privileges are established by a system administrator and that users are granted different privileges that reflect their standing within the organization. Access privileges based on authority levels would give a user permission to access any data classified at the user's clearance level or lower. Access permission based upon a need-to-know basis provides an additional degree of security. Document level security ensures that users are able to access (or create or modify) only the documents they are allowed to see (or modify). By storing user profiles, users are enabled to view documents they have permission to see without being challenged to specify their access credentials.

Beldock stores compliance data on a database; thus establishing user access levels and privileges would ensure that only authorized users are able to view documents, and only able to view documents to which they have authority to access. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the teachings of Beldock to implement data access control privilege measures known in the art in order to obtain the additional benefits of additional data security as described above.

As per claim 17, Beldock does not explicitly teach creating queries to summarize data and produce useful management information.

However, it has been admitted as prior art, as a result of untimely and/or improperly challenged Official Notice, that querying and querying languages (such as Structured Query Language {SQL}) are old and well known in the computing and database arts.

Beldock stores compliance data in a database; thus, the use of querying languages would enable users to search for specific data using search queries. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the teachings of Beldock to include the step of creating data queries, as the step of querying a database quickly retrieves useful and relevant data (instead of raw, unprocessed, and irrelevant data), which provide meaningful information on which decisions can be made.

As per claim 19, Beldock teaches a system for monitoring environmental performance (**environmental certification program**) information comprising:

a program executable by the processor to:

store the performance information in a database (**compliance data into database 12**) as a function of an area of interest {**compliance data relates to a plurality of profitable environmental measures, each of which pertaining to a plurality of areas of interest such as energy efficiency, the use of renewable energy, recycling, waste minimization, health and safety, reduction of environmental liabilities, and corporate citizenship**} of the performance information

Art Unit: 3623

[Column 3, lines 31-38, 56-57, Column 4, lines 41-43, Column 5, lines 55-57, Claims 1c, 15c];

monitor said performance information at said specific times by said predetermined schedule currently stored for conformance against pre-established performance criteria **(evaluate and track the compliance of a participant; program defines the criteria which must be met by a participant in the program in order to be in compliance; the participant must implement (and maintain) a predefined number of additional PEMs at specified years after certification in order to maintain certification; {participant is evaluated at year 0, year 1, year 2, year 3, year 4, and year  $(4+2n)$ }}** [Column 3, lines 28-30, 56-57, 60-65, Column 4, lines 7-9, Figure 3, Claims 1a, 15a] in a system;

flag said performance information that does not conform with said performance criteria **(recording a non-compliance in the database)** and generate a report one of automatically and manually according to at least a portion of said performance information currently stored **(system outputs at 18 whether the participant is in compliance and therefore certified or outputs at 20 whether the participant is not in compliance and is therefore not certified)** [Column 3, lines 56-57, 60-66, Claims 1f, 15f];

provide notification **(system outputs at 18 whether the participant is in compliance and therefore certified or outputs at 20 whether the participant is not in compliance and is therefore not certified)** when said performance

information deviates from said performance criteria **(identified profitable environmental measure are reported to the organizers of the environmental certification program and input into the database 12; participant reports its compliance {or non-compliance} with the program to the organizers of the program)** [Column 3, lines 59-66, Column 4, lines 40-43, Column 5, lines 55-57];

modify said performance so that said performance conforms with said performance criteria **(participants are given a short period of time in which to correct any inadvertent defects in its compliance)** [Column 6, lines 4-6]; and

wherein said modifying said performance is conducted immediately subsequent to said providing notification when said performance information deviates from said performance criteria **{the participant is apprised of its failure to comply with particular requirements, which are allowed to be remedied during the brief grace period}** [Column 5, line 64 – Column 6, line 9].

Beldock does not explicitly teach that performance criteria is set at one of a global, a regional, and a site-specific level. However, it has been admitted as prior art, as a result of untimely and/or improperly challenged Official Notice, that it is old and well known in the art to for compliance data to be updated to reflect changes in federal, state, and local laws and regulations, program requirements of federal and state-funded programs, and industry standards (such as ISO certification, Quality Control Initiatives, etc.), as well as self-imposed rules and regulations, thereby meeting the limitation of the claim.

Beldock does not explicitly teach:

(i) automatically creating an audit trail to said forms, wherein said audit trail comprises: a name of an author, a creation date, a name of a modifying user, and a date of modification

However, It has been admitted as prior art, as a result of untimely and/or improperly challenged Official Notice, that it is old and well known in the computing arts that computer operating systems use Master File Tables to store resident attributes for each computer file, including the filename, data, times of creation/modification or access and the user who last created/modified/accessed said file.

Beldock stores data in a database; thus, using Master File Tables would provide means of tracking activity by users to track the integrity of data using audit trails. Furthermore, it has been admitted as prior art, as a result of untimely and/or improperly challenged Official Notice, that it is old and well known in the computing arts to create audit trails of data usage within the system, especially within databases. Audit trail techniques contribute to data integrity because it is desirable to have a past record of events where the sequence of events can be traced. Audit trails are helpful in investigations to verify the status of something or to determine where or when unauthorized activities took place. Sometimes, those who are authorized to access data abuse that right by using it for unauthorized purposes. Audit trails make it possible

Art Unit: 3623

to discover the offender. The audit trail can be closely monitored for any unusual activity. An audit trail is a chronological record of events that occurred in the system, and enables users to retrace the steps through the system and reconstruct the sequence of events that occurred. Audit trails store information that attribute files to an author (or modifying user) and timestamp said file (upon creation and modification).

Furthermore, it was known at the time of the invention that merely providing an automated way to replace a well-known activity which accomplishes the same result is not sufficient to distinguish over the prior art. *In re Venner*, 262 F.2d 91, 95, 120 USPQ 193, 194 (CCPA 1958). Furthermore, it is well settled that it is not "invention" to broadly provide a mechanical or automatic means to replace manual activity which has accomplished the same result. *In re Venner*, 120 USPQ 192.

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the teachings of Beldock to implement audit trail measures known in the art in order to obtain the additional benefits of providing a historical record of events that enable users to determine the abusive actions and identifies of (authorized and unauthorized) users, as described above, providing a sense of accountability and responsibility amongst users.

Beldock does not explicitly teach:

a processor;



a data storage device operably connected to the processor, said data storage device further comprising a number of individual storage units for storing a predetermined type of data; and

system accepting a plurality of forms from a plurality of sites at specific times by said predetermined schedule, each of said forms including instructions, definitions, and performance information according to uniform data definitions.

However, Beldock teaches the use of a database (**database 12**) to store data. The use of a database inherently requires the use of computing devices (which include a processor) and databases are operably connected to computing devices; thus Beldock meets the limitations of the claim.

Beldock collects performance information from a plurality of facilities to assess program compliance with predefined criteria based on a function of performance at a plurality of facilities (the program requires that 4 profitable environmental measures are presently implemented at at least one facility, 4 profitable environmental measures are implemented in at least one facility, or a combination, and that said profitable environmental measures are implemented in 75% of all facilities within 3 years of initial certification in order to maintain certification) [Column 4, line 4- Column 5, line 53]. The environmental certification program taught by Beldock also teaches the step of obtaining certification compliance data after assessment (at specific time) of each year's predetermined certification conditions for compliance (as determined by a set of

Art Unit: 3623

predetermined certification criteria for each year) [Column 5, lines 55-63]. The Beldock system also obtains a bill of materials (a definition) comprising the chemical components of chemical products to be manufactured that can be compared to a "recipe" used to manufacture the chemical product, which is then compared to a stored set of government regulatory standards (uniform data definitions) governing the manufacturing location for the manufactured chemical product [Column 1, lines 56-59, Column 2, lines 45-54]. The Beldock system also teaches the steps of proposing (or defining) modifications to noncomplying chemical products (so that the chemical product to be manufactured is in compliance), and suggesting (or defining) substitutions for components in mixtures [Column 2, lines 60-65].

While Beldock teaches the step of collecting performance information data from a plurality of sites, Beldock is silent regarding the use of forms. However, it is old and well known in the art that forms are used in transmitting data (such as Electronic Data Interchange, survey results, questionnaires, etc.). Beldock tracks the compliance of a participant in the environmental certification program and also conducts on-site verification of compliance [Column 2, lines 21-23, Column 3, lines 55-57]; thus, using forms to enter data would provide a uniform data set for each participant, easing the burden of data processing and further enabling utilization of the Beldock system on a global scale. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the teachings of Beldock to accept performance information in forms, to enable the use of data transfer means such as Electronic Data

Art Unit: 3623

Interchange, and standardize the presentation of data on said forms (to include pre-filled data such as company name, address, etc.), which would enable the automated processing of information on the forms.

Beldock does not explicitly teach said modifying of said performance occurring in real time. However, Official Notice is taken that real-time updating is old and well known in the art. Beldock teaches that participants are given a short period of time in which to correct any inadvertent defects in its compliance [Column 5, line 65 – Column 6, line 19]; thus, modifying performance in real time would facilitate the changes needed to correct all aspects in which the participant is in non-compliance, thereby making the participant eligible to use the certification mark again. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the teachings of Beldock to modify performance in real time, because doing so would allow participants to continuously monitor performance and implement corrective measures in order to be in compliance with predefined criteria and retain eligibility to display said certification mark. The eligibility to display certification marks and be in compliance with predefined criteria has been identified by Beldock as being beneficial and a goal of participants, as Beldock explains that companies vie for environmental awards given by the government for the prestige associated with such awards, perceived economic value, and public awareness and that the certification mark provided by the program has discernable value in the marketplace, signifying the participant's dedication to

environmental concerns and the willingness to be a model environmental citizen.

[Column 1, lines 32-52].

As per claim 38, Beldock teaches computer executable process steps operative to control a computer, stored on a computer readable medium, for monitoring performance information comprising the steps of:

storing said performance information in a database (**compliance data into database 12**) according to an area of interest of said performance information [Column 3, lines 56-57, Column 4, lines 41-43, Column 5, lines 55-57, Claims 1c, 15c];

monitoring said performance information at said specific times by said predetermine schedule currently stored for conformance against pre-established performance criteria (**evaluate and track the compliance of a participant; program defines the criteria which must be met by a participant in the program in order to be in compliance; the participant must implement (and maintain) a predefined number of additional PEMs at specified years after certification in order to maintain certification; {participant is evaluated at year 0, year 1, year 2, year 3, year 4, and year (4+2n)}**) [Column 3, lines 28-30, 56-57, 60-65, Column 4, lines 7-9, Figure 3, Claims 1a, 15a];

flagging said performance information that does not conform with said performance criteria (**recording a non-compliance in the database**) and generating a report one of automatically and manually according to at least a portion of said performance information currently stored (**system outputs at 18 whether the**

**participant is in compliance and therefore certified or outputs at 20 whether the participant is not in compliance and is therefore not certified)** [Column 3, lines 56-57, 60-66, Claims 1f, 15f];

providing notification **(system outputs at 18 whether the participant is in compliance and therefore certified or outputs at 20 whether the participant is not in compliance and is therefore not certified)** when the performance information deviates from the performance criteria **(identified profitable environmental measure are reported to the organizers of the environmental certification program and input into the database 12; participant reports its compliance {or non-compliance} with the program to the organizers of the program)** [Column 3, lines 59-66, Column 4, lines 40-43, Column 5, lines 55-57];

modifying said performance so that said performance conforms with said performance criteria **(participants are given a short period of time in which to correct any inadvertent defects in its compliance)** [Column 6, lines 4-6]; and

wherein said modifying said performance is conducted immediately subsequent to said providing notification when said performance information deviates from said performance criteria **{the participant is apprised of its failure to comply with particular requirements, which are allowed to be remedied during the brief grace period}** [Column 5, line 64 – Column 6, line 9].

Beldock does not explicitly teach that performance criteria is set at one of a global, a regional, and a site-specific level. However, it has been admitted as prior art,

as a result of untimely and/or improperly challenged Official Notice, that it is old and well known in the art to for compliance data to be updated to reflect changes in federal, state, and local laws and regulations, program requirements of federal and state-funded programs, and industry standards (such as ISO certification, Quality Control Initiatives, etc.), as well as self-imposed rules and regulations, thereby meeting the limitation of the claim.

Beldock does not explicitly teach:

(i) automatically creating an audit trail to said forms, wherein said audit trail comprises: a name of an author, a creation date, a name of a modifying user, and a date of modification

However, It has been admitted as prior art, as a result of untimely and/or improperly challenged Official Notice, that it is old and well known in the computing arts that computer operating systems use Master File Tables to store resident attributes for each computer file, including the filename, data, times of creation/modification or access and the user who last created/modified/accessed said file.

Beldock stores data in a database; thus, using Master File Tables would provide means of tracking activity by users to track the integrity of data using audit trails. Furthermore, it has been admitted as prior art, as a result of untimely and/or improperly challenged Official Notice, that it is old and well known in the computing arts to create

Art Unit: 3623

audit trails of data usage within the system, especially within databases. Audit trail techniques contribute to data integrity because it is desirable to have a past record of events where the sequence of events can be traced. Audit trails are helpful in investigations to verify the status of something or to determine where or when unauthorized activities took place. Sometimes, those who are authorized to access data abuse that right by using it for unauthorized purposes. Audit trails make it possible to discover the offender. The audit trail can be closely monitored for any unusual activity. An audit trail is a chronological record of events that occurred in the system, and enables users to retrace the steps through the system and reconstruct the sequence of events that occurred. Audit trails store information that attribute files to an author (or modifying user) and timestamp said file (upon creation and modification).

Furthermore, it was known at the time of the invention that merely providing an automated way to replace a well-known activity which accomplishes the same result is not sufficient to distinguish over the prior art. *In re Venner*, 262 F.2d 91, 95, 120 USPQ 193, 194 (CCPA 1958). Furthermore, it is well settled that it is not "invention" to broadly provide a mechanical or automatic means to replace manual activity which has accomplished the same result. *In re Venner*, 120 USPQ 192.

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the teachings of Beldock to implement audit trail measures known in the art in order to obtain the additional benefits of providing a historical record of events

that enable users to determine the abusive actions and identifies of (authorized and unauthorized) users, as described above, providing a sense of accountability and responsibility amongst users.

Beldock does not explicitly teach:

(b) system accepting a plurality of forms from a plurality of sites, each of the forms including performance information as a function of uniform data definitions.

Beldock collects performance information from a plurality of facilities to assess program compliance with predefined criteria based on a function of performance at a plurality of facilities (the program requires that 4 profitable environmental measures are presently implemented at at least one facility, 4 profitable environmental measures are implemented in at least one facility, or a combination, and that said profitable environmental measures are implemented in 75% of all facilities within 3 years of initial certification in order to maintain certification) [Column 4, line 4- Column 5, line 53].

While Beldock teaches the step of collecting performance information data from a plurality of sites, Beldock is silent regarding the use of forms. However, it is old and well known in the art that forms are used in transmitting data (such as Electronic Data Interchange, survey results, questionnaires, etc.). Beldock tracks the compliance of a participant in the environmental certification program and also conducts on-site verification of compliance [Column 2, lines 21-23, Column 3, lines 55-57]; thus, using



forms to enter data would provide a uniform data set for each participant, easing the burden of data processing and further enabling utilization of the Beldock system on a global scale. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the teachings of Beldock to accept performance information in forms, to enable the use of data transfer means such as Electronic Data Interchange, and standardize the presentation of data on said forms (to include pre-filled data such as company name, address, etc.), which would enable the automated processing of information on the forms.

Beldock does not explicitly teach said modifying of said performance occurring in real time. However, Official Notice is taken that real-time updating is old and well known in the art. Beldock teaches that participants are given a short period of time in which to correct any inadvertent defects in its compliance [Column 5, line 65 – Column 6, line 19]; thus, modifying performance in real time would facilitate the changes needed to correct all aspects in which the participant is in non-compliance, thereby making the participant eligible to use the certification mark again. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the teachings of Beldock to modify performance in real time, because doing so would allow participants to continuously monitor performance and implement corrective measures in order to be in compliance with predefined criteria and retain eligibility to display said certification mark. The eligibility to display certification marks and be in compliance with predefined criteria has been identified by Beldock as being beneficial and a goal of

Art Unit: 3623

participants, as Beldock explains that companies vie for environmental awards given by the government for the prestige associated with such awards, perceived economic value, and public awareness and that the certification mark provided by the program has discernable value in the marketplace, signifying the participant's dedication to environmental concerns and the willingness to be a model environmental citizen.

[Column 1, lines 32-52].

Claims 20-24, 28-32, 34, 36, 39-43, 46-50, 52 and 54 repeat the limitations of claims 2-6, 9-13 and 15,17 respectively; therefore, the same rejection applies.

3. Claims 7, 18, 25, 37, 44 and 55 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beldock (U.S Patent #6,490, 565) as applied to claims 1, 19, and 38 above, and further in view of Petke et al (U.S Patent #6,163,732).

As per claim 7, although not explicitly taught by Beldock, Petke et al. teaches said providing notification further comprises **(automatically)** notifying an environmental professional **(notifying a governmental authority)** [Claim 31].

Beldock is directed to defining compliance criteria and recording an organization's compliance (or non-compliance) with said criteria. Petke et al. is directed to determining the compliance of chemical products to government regulations. Thus,

both Beldock and Petke et al. are both directed to the analogous art of determining an organization's compliance to specific criteria.

Beldock stores compliance data in a database, which is used to evaluate the participant's compliance and determine whether the participant retains the privilege of displaying a certification mark in conjunction with its goods and advertisements; thus, notifying environmental professionals of performance would enable compliant participants to be recognized as environmentally responsible, making the public aware of the participant's accomplishments. Beldock explains that companies vie for environmental awards given by the government for the prestige associated with such awards, perceived economic value, and public awareness and that the certification mark provided by the program has discernable value in the marketplace, signifying the participant's dedication to environmental concerns and the willingness to be a model environmental citizen [Column 1, lines 32-52, Column 6, lines 10-19].

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the teachings of Beldock to notify an environmental professional in order to quickly obtain remedies to problems, misconduct or wrongdoings that resulted in a failure to comply with predetermined compliance criteria (also providing the benefit of minimizing adverse consequences), and to disseminate a positive, law-abiding corporate value, creating an atmosphere that discourages wrongdoing.

As per claim 18, Beldock does not explicitly teach that said creating step further comprises sorting by a specific chemical.

However, it has been admitted as prior art, as a result of untimely and/or improperly challenged Official Notice, that it is old and well known in the computing and database arts that database queries select records from one or more tables in a database according to a set of input parameters so that they can be viewed, sorted, analyzed, on a common datasheet. Furthermore, there are a plurality of rules, regulations, and laws governing the usage of chemicals and the composition of chemical products. The compositional information is reviewed periodically for opportunities to change to processes that are more environmentally friendly.

For chemical compounds or compositions, Petke et al. teaches the analysis of :

activity, and distribution (manufacturers must notify the EPA each time it samples or sells any of certain listed chemicals into another country for the first time; the DEA requires a manufacturer to notify them of potential new customers for certain chemicals; the Chemical Warfare Convention limits the sale of certain chemicals; the sale of any chemical to one or more specific customer may be limited) [Column 22, lines 1-3, 33-57]; and

disposition and decomposition (chemical compositions present in chemical products may be ascertained by obtaining a bill of materials comprising the chemical components of the chemical product to be manufactured) [Column 1, lines 56-59, Column 13, lines 7-Column 21, line 10]

Beldock is directed to defining compliance criteria and recording an organization's compliance (or non-compliance) with said criteria. Petke et al. is directed to determining the compliance of chemical products to government regulations. Thus, both Beldock and Petke et al. are both directed to the analogous art of determining an organization's compliance to specific criteria.

Beldock stores data in a database; thus, sorting data enables users to avoid inefficiently scanning large clusters of data to analyze data. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the teachings of Beldock to include the step of sorting data by chemical, in order to perform the analysis taught by Petke et al. in comparing chemical compositions to a stored set of government regulatory standards to determine compliance and assess a chemical's use rate and disposition for compliance with a plurality of regulations, rules, and laws.

Claims 25, 37, 44 and 55 repeat the limitations of claims 7 and 18 respectively; therefore, the same rejection applies.

4. Claims 8, 26, and 45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beldock as applied to claims 1, 19, and 38 above, and further in view of Barrett et al. (U.S Patent #6,029,144).

As per claim 8, although not explicitly taught by Beldock, Barrett et al. teaches:  
reviewing data in the database for nonconformance with said modified  
performance criteria (**checking entries against each relevant rule in the rules  
database 402**) [Column 7, lines 41-48, Claims 1, 13a & 13b]; and  
providing notification of nonconformance with said modified performance criteria  
(**log the rule violation and send, along with a recommendation for action, to the  
auditor system**) [Column 8, lines 58-60, Claims 1, 13b & 13c].

Beldock is directed to defining compliance criteria and recording an  
organization's compliance (or non-compliance) with said criteria. Barrett et al. is directed  
to checking entries for compliance with policy rules. Thus, both Beldock and Barrett et  
al. are directed to the analogous art of checking an organization's compliance with rules  
and criteria.

Beldock stores compliance data in a database, which is used to evaluate the  
participant's compliance and determine whether the participant retains the privilege of  
displaying a certification mark in conjunction with its goods and advertisements; thus,  
notification of compliance performance would enable compliant participants to be

Art Unit: 3623

recognized as environmentally responsible, making the public aware of the participant's accomplishments, and for noncompliant participants to be made aware of their inability to utilize said certification mark and make necessary corrections to inadvertent defects in its compliance during the short grace period given to participants. Beldock explains that companies vie for environmental awards given by the government for the prestige associated with such awards, perceived economic value, and public awareness and that the certification mark provided by the program has discernable value in the marketplace, signifying the participant's dedication to environmental concerns and the willingness to be a model environmental citizen. Beldock also teaches that participants are given a short period of time in which to correct any inadvertent defects in its compliance [Column 1, lines 32-52, Column 5, line 65 – Column 6, line 19].

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the teachings of Beldock to include the steps of comparing data with compliance requirements, and providing notification of nonconformance with said compliance requirements, because it would provide a basis to benchmark existing programs, identify improvement opportunities and identify potential best practices, and help a business focus on developing and delivering near-perfect products and services, while improving customer satisfaction, and providing an up-to-date assessment (and compliance with all updated applicable rules, laws and regulations) of company practices, further enhancing shareholder values while reducing potential risks to the business.

Although the combined teachings of Beldock and Barrett et al. do not explicitly teach the step of modifying performance criteria, it has been admitted as prior art, as a result of untimely and/or improperly challenged Official Notice, that compliance criteria needs to be updated to reflect changes in federal, state, and local laws and regulations, program requirements of federal and state-funded programs, and industry standards (such as ISO certification, Quality Control Initiatives, etc.), as well as self-imposed rules and regulations.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the teachings of Beldock et al. to modify performance criteria, to provide accurate assessments of compliance with all current and valid limitations (as discussed above), as assessing compliance using outdated rules yields a useless result, which may result in undesirable consequences for a failure to comply.

Claims 26 and 45 repeat the limitations of claim 8 respectively; therefore, the same rejection applies.

5. Claims 14, 33, and 51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beldock (U.S Patent #6,490,565) as applied to claims 1, 19, and 38, above, and further in view of Smalley et al. (U.S Patent #6,067,549).



As per claim 14, although not explicitly taught by Beldock, Smalley et al. teaches generating a summary report **(enforcement order report)** at a pre-established review period, wherein said report comprises a comparison of said performance information to said performance criteria in the system **(listing violations that need to be addressed, along with the amount of the penalty and corrective actions to be required)** [Column 19, lines 30-47].

Beldock is directed to defining compliance criteria and recording an organization's compliance (or non-compliance) with said criteria. Smalley et al. is directed to managing information on regulated entities pertaining to environmental concerns in order to determine if any violations of regulatory requirements have been made. Thus, both Beldock and Smalley et al. are directed to the analogous art of collecting information to determine if an organization is in compliance with requirements.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the teachings of Beldock to include the step of generating a summary report, because it would provide a basis to benchmark existing programs, identify improvement opportunities and identify potential best practices, help a business focus on developing and delivering near-perfect products and services, while improving customer satisfaction, ensuring that all activities are in compliance with all applicable rules, laws and regulations, and further enhances shareholder values while reducing potential risks to the business.

Claims 33 and 51 repeat the limitations of claims 14 respectively; therefore, the same rejection applies.

### **(10) Response to Argument**

#### ***Official Notice***

The Examiner notes that the following statements have been admitted as prior art as per MPEP 2144.03(c) because no proper or timely traversal was made in the response following the Office Action in which Official Notice was taken that:

- It is old and well known in the art to include instructions and definitions along with performance information
- It is old and well known in the art that forms are used in transmitting data (such as Electronic Data Interchange, survey results, questionnaires, facsimile, e-mail, etc.)
- Real time updating is old and well known in the art
- It is old and well known in the business arts that an organization can comprise a single site, or multiple sites
- Distributing notification memos or documents using e-mail, telephone, facsimile, pager, or postal mail is old and well-known practice
- It is old and well known in the art to employ a ratio (such as a cost: savings, cost: benefit ratio) or similar means of comparison to express the advantages of using

new technologies, equipment, policies, etc. and are used to evaluate efficiency of resources

- Access control privileges are established by a system administrator and users are granted different privileges that reflect their standing within the organization
- It is old and well known in the computing arts that computer operating systems use Master File Tables to store resident attributes for each computer file, including the filename, data, times of creation/modification or access and the user who last created/modified/accessed said file
- It is old and well known in the computing arts to create audit trails of data usage within the system, especially within databases
- Querying and querying languages (such as Structured Query Language {SQL}) are old and well known in the computing and database arts
- It is old and well known in the computing arts and database arts that database queries select records from one or more tables in a database according to a set of input parameters so that they can be viewed, stored, analyzed, on a common datasheet
- Compliance data needs to be updated to reflect changes in federal, state, and local laws and regulations, program requirements of federal and state-funded programs, and industry standards (such as ISO certification, Quality Control Initiatives, etc.), as well as self-imposed rules and regulations

Claims 1, 19 and 38

Appellant argues that Beldock teaches against the claimed feature "wherein said modifying said performance is conducted immediately subsequent to said providing notification when said performance information deviates from said performance criteria so that said modifying of said performance occurs in real time" because Beldock teaches that participants are given "a short period of time" in which to correct any inadvertent defects in its compliance; thus, performance modification is not conducted "immediately subsequent" to notification so that the modification "occurs in real time".

The Examiner respectfully disagrees. As previously asserted in the Advisory Action mailed May 24, 2007, "real time" refers to a system that responds to events as they happen. "Real time" relates to a time frame imposed by external constraints and "real time" actions are those in which activities match the human perception of time or those in which computer operations proceed at the same rate as a physical or external process. "Real time" operations are those in which a computer must respond to situations as they occur. The Examiner asserts that the "short period of time" (grace period) taught by Beldock is a deadline given to applicants in which to correct any inadvertent defects in its compliance, and is not a time differential between the notification and the modification; in other words, performance modification is conducted subsequent to receiving notification of non-compliance and thus is in "real time". Further, the Examiner notes that Official Notice was taken that "real-time updating is old and well known in the art". Thus, the Examiner asserts that the grace period taught by Beldock does not teach away from the claimed step of modifying performance

"immediately subsequent" to notification of such defects so that the modifying "occurs in real time".

Appellant further argues that because Beldock teaches an environmental certification program that provides a "uniform criteria" for participants in the program, Beldock teaches against the claimed features "wherein said performance criteria is set at one of a global, a regional, and a site-specific level".

The Examiner respectfully disagrees. The Examiner notes that it has been admitted as prior art, as a result of untimely and/or improperly challenged Official Notice, that it is old and well known in the art for compliance data to be updated to reflect changes in federal, state, and local laws and regulations, program requirements of federal and state-funded programs, and industry standards (such as ISO certification, Quality Control Initiatives, etc.), as well as self-imposed rules and regulations.

Although Beldock teaches the use of uniform criteria for all participants in the program [abstract], Beldock also teaches the use of predefined criteria to certify a participant in the program as being in compliance with the program, as well as additional predefined criteria in addition to maintaining the predefined criteria which led to initial certification [Column 1, line 66 - Column 2, line 28]. Beldock allows for modifications to the scope of the compliance criteria **(While a particular embodiment of the invention has been described, it is not intended that the invention be**

**limited thereto, as it is intended that the invention be as broad in scope as the art will allow and that the specification be read likewise. Thus, while particular categories of environmentally beneficial criteria have been disclosed, it will be understood that other categories may be used)** [Column 6, lines 22-31]. Thus, the Examiner asserts that the combination of the teachings of Beldock, with admitted prior art that it is old and well known in the art for compliance data to be updated to reflect changes in federal, state, and local laws and regulations, program requirements of federal and state-funded programs, and industry standards (such as ISO certification, Quality Control Initiatives, etc.), as well as self-imposed rules and regulations, would have been obvious.

Where a claimed improvement on a device or apparatus is no more than "the simple substitution of one known element for another or the mere application of a known technique to a piece of prior art ready for improvement," the claim is unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. 103(a). *Ex Parte Smith*, 83 USPQ.2d 1509, 1518-19 (BPAI, 2007) (citing *KSR v. Teleflex*, 127 S.Ct. 1727, 1740, 82 USPQ2d 1385, 1396 (2007)). Accordingly, Appellant claims a combination that only unites old elements with no change in the respective functions of those old elements, and the combination of those elements yields predictable results; absent evidence that the modifications necessary to effect the combination of elements is uniquely challenging or difficult for one of ordinary skill in the art, the claim is unpatentable as obvious under 35 U.S.C. 103(a). *Ex Parte Smith*, 83 USPQ.2d at 1518-19 (BPAI, 2007) (citing *KSR*, 127 S.Ct. at 1740, 82 USPQ2d at 1396.

Accordingly, since the appellant[s] have submitted no persuasive evidence that the combination of the above elements is uniquely challenging or difficult for one of ordinary skill in the art, the claim is unpatentable as obvious under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) because it is no more than the predictable use of prior art elements according to their established functions resulting in the simple substitution of one known element for another or the mere application of a known technique to a piece of prior art ready for improvement. Thus, the Examiner asserts that Beldock, in combination with admitted prior art, does indeed teach the step of setting performance criteria at one of a global, regional and site-specific level.

Claims 2, 20 and 39

Appellant argues that Beldock teaches against the claimed "site-specific performance criteria" because Beldock applies a uniform criteria upon all of the sites.

The Examiner respectfully disagrees. The Examiner notes that it has been admitted as prior art, as a result of untimely and/or improperly challenged Official Notice, that it is old and well known in the art that an organization can comprise a single site, or multiple sites. The Examiner further notes that it has been admitted as prior art in claims 1, 19 and 38, as a result of untimely and/or improperly challenged Official Notice, that it is old and well known in the art for compliance data to be updated to reflect changes in federal, state, and local laws and regulations, program requirements

of federal and state-funded programs, and industry standards (such as ISO certification, Quality Control Initiatives, etc.), as well as self-imposed rules and regulations.

Although Beldock teaches the use of uniform criteria for all participants in the program [abstract], Beldock also teaches the use of predefined criteria to certify a participant in the program as being in compliance with the program, as well as additional predefined criteria in addition to maintaining the predefined criteria which led to initial certification [Column 1, line 66 - Column 2, line 28]. Beldock allows for modifications to the scope of the compliance criteria **(While a particular embodiment of the invention has been described, it is not intended that the invention be limited thereto, as it is intended that the invention be as broad in scope as the art will allow and that the specification be read likewise. Thus, while particular categories of environmentally beneficial criteria have been disclosed, it will be understood that other categories may be used)** [Column 6, lines 22-31]. Thus, the Examiner asserts that the combination of the teachings of Beldock with admitted prior art that it is old and well known in the art for organizations to comprise a single site or multiple sites, further in view of admitted prior art that it is old and well known in the art for compliance data to be updated to reflect changes in federal, state, and local laws and regulations, program requirements of federal and state-funded programs, and industry standards (such as ISO certification, Quality Control Initiatives, etc.), as well as self-imposed rules and regulations, to yield a system that evaluates a plurality of sites using site-specific performance criteria would have been obvious.



Where a claimed improvement on a device or apparatus is no more than "the simple substitution of one known element for another or the mere application of a known technique to a piece of prior art ready for improvement," the claim is unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. 103(a). *Ex Parte Smith*, 83 USPQ.2d 1509, 1518-19 (BPAI, 2007) (citing *KSR v. Teleflex*, 127 S.Ct. 1727, 1740, 82 USPQ2d 1385, 1396 (2007)). Accordingly, Appellant claims a combination that only unites old elements with no change in the respective functions of those old elements, and the combination of those elements yields predictable results; absent evidence that the modifications necessary to effect the combination of elements is uniquely challenging or difficult for one of ordinary skill in the art, the claim is unpatentable as obvious under 35 U.S.C. 103(a). *Ex Parte Smith*, 83 USPQ.2d at 1518-19 (BPAI, 2007) (citing *KSR*, 127 S.Ct. at 1740, 82 USPQ2d at 1396). Accordingly, since the appellant[s] have submitted no persuasive evidence that the combination of the above elements is uniquely challenging or difficult for one of ordinary skill in the art, the claim is unpatentable as obvious under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) because it is no more than the predictable use of prior art elements according to their established functions resulting in the simple substitution of one known element for another or the mere application of a known technique to a piece of prior art ready for improvement. Thus, the Examiner asserts that Beldock, in combination with admitted prior art, does indeed teach the step of setting site-specific performance criteria for a specific plurality of sites.

Claims 3, 21 and 40

Appellant argues that Beldock teaches against the claimed features wherein said specific set of sites is a single site and said site-specific performance criteria comprises said performance criteria for said single site because Beldock imposes a uniform criteria imposed upon all of the sites.

The Examiner respectfully disagrees. The Examiner notes that it has been admitted as prior art, as a result of untimely and/or improperly challenged Official Notice, that it is old and well known in the art that an organization can comprise a single site, or multiple sites. The Examiner further notes that it has been admitted as prior art in claims 1, 19 and 38, as a result of untimely and/or improperly challenged Official Notice, that it is old and well known in the art for compliance data to be updated to reflect changes in federal, state, and local laws and regulations, program requirements of federal and state-funded programs, and industry standards (such as ISO certification, Quality Control Initiatives, etc.), as well as self-imposed rules and regulations.

Although Beldock teaches the use of uniform criteria for all participants in the program [abstract], Beldock also teaches the use of predefined criteria to certify a participant in the program as being in compliance with the program, as well as additional predefined criteria in addition to maintaining the predefined criteria which led to initial certification [Column 1, line 66 - Column 2, line 28]. Beldock allows for modifications to the scope of the compliance criteria **(While a particular embodiment**

**of the invention has been described, it is not intended that the invention be limited thereto, as it is intended that the invention be as broad in scope as the art will allow and that the specification be read likewise. Thus, while particular categories of environmentally beneficial criteria have been disclosed, it will be understood that other categories may be used)** [Column 6, lines 22-31]. Thus, the Examiner asserts that the combination of the teachings of Beldock with admitted prior art that it is old and well known in the art for organizations to comprise a single site or multiple sites, further in view of admitted prior art that it is old and well known in the art for compliance data to be updated to reflect changes in federal, state, and local laws and regulations, program requirements of federal and state-funded programs, and industry standards (such as ISO certification, Quality Control Initiatives, etc.), as well as self-imposed rules and regulations, to yield a system that evaluates a single site using site-specific performance criteria would have been obvious.

Where a claimed improvement on a device or apparatus is no more than "the simple substitution of one known element for another or the mere application of a known technique to a piece of prior art ready for improvement," the claim is unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. 103(a). *Ex Parte Smith*, 83 USPQ.2d 1509, 1518-19 (BPAI, 2007) (citing *KSR v. Teleflex*, 127 S.Ct. 1727, 1740, 82 USPQ2d 1385, 1396 (2007)). Accordingly, Appellant claims a combination that only unites old elements with no change in the respective functions of those old elements, and the combination of those elements yields predictable results; absent evidence that the modifications necessary to effect the

Art Unit: 3623

combination of elements is uniquely challenging or difficult for one of ordinary skill in the art, the claim is unpatentable as obvious under 35 U.S.C. 103(a). Ex Parte Smith, 83 USPQ.2d at 1518-19 (BPAI, 2007) (citing KSR, 127 S.Ct. at 1740, 82 USPQ2d at 1396. Accordingly, since the appellant[s] have submitted no persuasive evidence that the combination of the above elements is uniquely challenging or difficult for one of ordinary skill in the art, the claim is unpatentable as obvious under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) because it is no more than the predictable use of prior art elements according to their established functions resulting in the simple substitution of one known element for another or the mere application of a known technique to a piece of prior art ready for improvement. Thus, the Examiner asserts that Beldock, in combination with admitted prior art, does indeed teach the step of setting site-specific performance criteria for a specific, single site.

#### Claims 4, 22 and 41

Appellant argues that Beldock teaches against the claimed features wherein said specific set of sites comprises multiple sites and said site-specific performance criteria comprises said performance criteria for the multiple sites because Beldock teaches setting "uniform" performance criteria.

The Examiner respectfully disagrees. The Examiner notes that it has been admitted as prior art, as a result of untimely and/or improperly challenged Official Notice, that it is old and well known in the art that an organization can comprise a single

Art Unit: 3623

site, or multiple sites. The Examiner further notes that it has been admitted as prior art in claims 1, 19 and 38, as a result of untimely and/or improperly challenged Official Notice, that it is old and well known in the art for compliance data to be updated to reflect changes in federal, state, and local laws and regulations, program requirements of federal and state-funded programs, and industry standards (such as ISO certification, Quality Control Initiatives, etc.), as well as self-imposed rules and regulations.

Although Beldock teaches the use of uniform criteria for all participants in the program [abstract], Beldock also teaches the use of predefined criteria to certify a participant in the program as being in compliance with the program, as well as additional predefined criteria in addition to maintaining the predefined criteria which led to initial certification [Column 1, line 66 - Column 2, line 28]. Beldock allows for modifications to the scope of the compliance criteria **(While a particular embodiment of the invention has been described, it is not intended that the invention be limited thereto, as it is intended that the invention be as broad in scope as the art will allow and that the specification be read likewise. Thus, while particular categories of environmentally beneficial criteria have been disclosed, it will be understood that other categories may be used)** [Column 6, lines 22-31]. Thus, the Examiner asserts that the combination of the teachings of Beldock with admitted prior art that it is old and well known in the art for organizations to comprise a single site or multiple sites, further in view of admitted prior art that it is old and well known in the art for compliance data to be updated to reflect changes in federal, state, and local laws

and regulations, program requirements of federal and state-funded programs, and industry standards (such as ISO certification, Quality Control Initiatives, etc.), as well as self-imposed rules and regulations, to yield a system that evaluates a plurality of sites using site-specific performance criteria for said plurality of sites would have been obvious.

Where a claimed improvement on a device or apparatus is no more than "the simple substitution of one known element for another or the mere application of a known technique to a piece of prior art ready for improvement," the claim is unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. 103(a). *Ex Parte Smith*, 83 USPQ.2d 1509, 1518-19 (BPAI, 2007) (citing *KSR v. Teleflex*, 127 S.Ct. 1727, 1740, 82 USPQ2d 1385, 1396 (2007)). Accordingly, Appellant claims a combination that only unites old elements with no change in the respective functions of those old elements, and the combination of those elements yields predictable results; absent evidence that the modifications necessary to effect the combination of elements is uniquely challenging or difficult for one of ordinary skill in the art, the claim is unpatentable as obvious under 35 U.S.C. 103(a). *Ex Parte Smith*, 83 USPQ.2d at 1518-19 (BPAI, 2007) (citing *KSR*, 127 S.Ct. at 1740, 82 USPQ2d at 1396). Accordingly, since the appellant[s] have submitted no persuasive evidence that the combination of the above elements is uniquely challenging or difficult for one of ordinary skill in the art, the claim is unpatentable as obvious under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) because it is no more than the predictable use of prior art elements according to their established functions resulting in the simple substitution of one known element for another or the

mere application of a known technique to a piece of prior art ready for improvement. Thus, the Examiner asserts that Beldock, in combination with admitted prior art, does indeed teach the step of setting site-specific performance criteria for a specific plurality of sites.

Claims 5, 23 and 42

Appellant argues that Beldock teaches against the claimed features wherein said set of specific sites comprises all said plurality of sites and the site-specific performance criteria comprises said performance criteria for all said plurality of sites because Beldock teaches setting "uniform" performance criteria.

The Examiner respectfully disagrees. The Examiner notes that it has been admitted as prior art, as a result of untimely and/or improperly challenged Official Notice, that it is old and well known in the art that an organization can comprise a single site, or multiple sites. The Examiner further notes that it has been admitted as prior art in claims 1, 19 and 38, as a result of untimely and/or improperly challenged Official Notice, that it is old and well known in the art for compliance data to be updated to reflect changes in federal, state, and local laws and regulations, program requirements of federal and state-funded programs, and industry standards (such as ISO certification, Quality Control Initiatives, etc.), as well as self-imposed rules and regulations.

Although Beldock teaches the use of uniform criteria for all participants in the program [abstract], Beldock also teaches the use of predefined criteria to certify a participant in the program as being in compliance with the program, as well as additional predefined criteria in addition to maintaining the predefined criteria which led to initial certification [Column 1, line 66 - Column 2, line 28]. Beldock allows for modifications to the scope of the compliance criteria **(While a particular embodiment of the invention has been described, it is not intended that the invention be limited thereto, as it is intended that the invention be as broad in scope as the art will allow and that the specification be read likewise. Thus, while particular categories of environmentally beneficial criteria have been disclosed, it will be understood that other categories may be used)** [Column 6, lines 22-31]. Thus, the Examiner asserts that the combination of the teachings of Beldock with admitted prior art that it is old and well known in the art for organizations to comprise a single site or multiple sites, further in view of admitted prior art that it is old and well known in the art for compliance data to be updated to reflect changes in federal, state, and local laws and regulations, program requirements of federal and state-funded programs, and industry standards (such as ISO certification, Quality Control Initiatives, etc.), as well as self-imposed rules and regulations, to yield a system that evaluates a plurality of sites using site-specific performance criteria would have been obvious.

Where a claimed improvement on a device or apparatus is no more than "the simple substitution of one known element for another or the mere application of a known



technique to a piece of prior art ready for improvement," the claim is unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. 103(a). Ex Parte Smith, 83 USPQ.2d 1509, 1518-19 (BPAI, 2007) (citing KSR v. Teleflex, 127 S.Ct. 1727, 1740, 82 USPQ2d 1385, 1396 (2007)). Accordingly, Appellant claims a combination that only unites old elements with no change in the respective functions of those old elements, and the combination of those elements yields predictable results; absent evidence that the modifications necessary to effect the combination of elements is uniquely challenging or difficult for one of ordinary skill in the art, the claim is unpatentable as obvious under 35 U.S.C. 103(a). Ex Parte Smith, 83 USPQ.2d at 1518-19 (BPAI, 2007) (citing KSR, 127 S.Ct. at 1740, 82 USPQ2d at 1396. Accordingly, since the appellant[s] have submitted no persuasive evidence that the combination of the above elements is uniquely challenging or difficult for one of ordinary skill in the art, the claim is unpatentable as obvious under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) because it is no more than the predictable use of prior art elements according to their established functions resulting in the simple substitution of one known element for another or the mere application of a known technique to a piece of prior art ready for improvement. Thus, the Examiner asserts that Beldock, in combination with admitted prior art, does indeed teach the step of setting site-specific performance criteria for a plurality of sites.

Claims 7, 18, 25, 37, 44, 55

Appellant argues that the proposed combination of Beldock and Petke does not render obvious independent claims 1, 19 and 38 and similarly does not render obvious dependent claims 7, 18, 25, 37, 44 and 55.

The Examiner respectfully disagrees. The Examiner points out that the combination of Beldock and Petke was not asserted as having taught independent claims 1, 19 and 38. Petke was cited as having taught limitations in claims 7, 18, 25, 37, 44 and 55; thus, the Appellant's arguments with respect to claims 7, 18, 25, 37, 44, and 55 are rendered moot.

Claims 8, 26, 45

Appellant argues that the proposed combination of Beldock and Barrett does not render obvious independent claims 1, 19 and 38 and similarly does not render obvious dependent claims 8, 26 and 45.

The Examiner respectfully disagrees. The Examiner points out that the combination of Beldock and Barrett was not asserted as having taught independent claims 1, 19 and 38. Barrett was cited as having taught limitations in claims 8, 26 and 45; thus, the Appellant's arguments with respect to claims 8, 26 and 45 are rendered moot.

Claims 14, 33, 51

Appellant argues that the proposed combination of Beldock and Smalley does not render obvious independent claims 1, 19 and 38 and similarly does not render obvious dependent claims 14, 33 and 51.

The Examiner respectfully disagrees. The Examiner points out that the combination of Beldock and Smalley was not asserted as having taught independent claims 1, 19 and 38. Smalley was cited as having taught limitations in claims 14, 33 and 51; thus, the Appellant's arguments with respect to claims 14, 33 and 51 are rendered moot.

**(11) Related Proceeding(s) Appendix**

No decision rendered by a court or the Board is identified by the examiner in the Related Appeals and Interferences section of this examiner's answer.

For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.


Respectfully submitted,

PC

Peter Choi

Conferees:

Beth Van Doren 

  
BETH VAN DOREN  
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Vincent Millen



January 3, 2008